Case 2	.11-cv-04030-c3c-MLG Document 33 T	lied 09/24/12 Fage 1 0/3 Fage 1D #.1020		
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	CENTRAL DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10				
11	ROXANNE MINER, THOMAS MURRAY, JR., and BARRY HOLLANDER, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, and on behalf of the general	Case No. CV 11-04038 CJC (MLGx)		
12	HOLLANDER, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly	JUDGMENT		
13	situated, and on behalf of the general public,			
14	Plaintiff,			
15	VS.			
16 17	METLIFE BANK, N.A., a Delaware corporation, and DOES 1 through 50,			
18	inclusive,			
19	Defendants.			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
		CASE NO. CV 11 04029 CIC (MI Cv)		

1	On March 11, 2011, Plaintiff Thomas Murray, Jr. ("Murray") filed a Class			
2	Action Complaint against Defendant MetLife Bank, N.A. ("MetLife") in California			
3	state court. On March 17, 2011, Murray filed a First Amended Class Action			
4	Complaint ("FAC"). The FAC alleges the following claims for relief: (1) failure to			
5	pay wages; (2) failure to provide accurate wage statements; (3) failure to timely page			
6	wages upon termination; (4) unlawful deductions from wages; (5) failure to			
7	reimburse employee business expenses; (6) unfair competition for violations of the			
8	California Labor Code; (7) unfair competition for violations of the Fair Labor			
9	Standards Act ("FLSA"); and (8) penalties pursuant to the California Private			
10	Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"). Murray brings these claims on his own behalf			
11	as well as on behalf of other Branch Managers and Sales Managers who worked for			
12	MetLife in California during the applicable statute of limitations period. (FAC ¶¶			
13	1, 16, 18.) MetLife removed this action to Federal court.			
14	On September 24, 2012, MetLife's Motion for Summary Judgment or, in the			

On September 24, 2012, MetLife's Motion for Summary Judgment or, in the Alternative, Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Murray's Claims ("Motion") came on regularly for hearing before this Court. For the reasons stated at the hearing, the Court granted MetLife's Motion on Murray's First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action and as to Murray's class claims.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED AS FOLLOWS:

Judgment is entered in favor of MetLife and against Murray on Murray's First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action and as to Murray's class claims. Murray shall take nothing as a result of his First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action and/or his class claims, Murray's First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action and his class claims shall be dismissed with prejudice, and

MetL	ife shall recover its costs with re	spect to these cau	uses of action and claims.
2			1.
DA ₃ T	ED: 9/24/12	LIC DICEDICE	COLUMN HIDGE
4		U.S. DISTRICT	COURT JÚDGE
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		-2-	CASE NO. CV11-4038 CJC (MLGX)